UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/518,600	12/23/2005	Thomas Lampe	584212002400	3094

25225 7590 12/26/2008

MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
12531 HIGH BLUFF DRIVE
SUITE 100
SAN DIEGO, CA 92130-2040

EXAMINER	
QAZI, SABIHA NAIM	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
1612	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
12/26/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/518,600	LAMPE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Sabiha Qazi	1612	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-22* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-22* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *7*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

Non-Final Office Action

Claims 1-22 are pending. No claim is allowed at this time. No claim is allowed at this time.

Summary of this Office Action dated Monday, December 22, 2008

1. Information Disclosure Statement
2. Copending Applications
3. Specification
4. 35 USC § 112 (1) Written Description Rejection
5. 35 USC § 103(a) Rejection
6. Communication

Information Disclosure Statement

The listing of references in the specification is not a proper information disclosure statement. 37 CFR 1.98(b) requires a list of all patents, publications, or other information submitted for consideration by the Office, and MPEP § 609.04(a) states, "the list may not be incorporated into the specification but must be submitted in a separate paper." Therefore, unless the references have been cited by the examiner on form PTO-892, they have not been considered.

Copending Applications

Applicants must bring to the attention of the examiner, or other Office official involved with the examination of a particular application, information within their knowledge as to other copending United States applications, which are "material to patentability" of the application in question. MPEP 2001.06(b). See Dayco Products Inc. v. Total Containment Inc., 66 USPQ2d 1801 (CA FC 2003).

Specification

The specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-22 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Following reasons apply:

Present invention is drawn to the compounds of formula (I) and one of the salts thereof, **or one of the solvates thereof and one of the solvates of the salts thereof**.

1. There is no guidance or teaching how the solvate are prepared for the claimed compounds and their salts. Solvates of the compounds cannot be predicted, see VIPPAGUNTA (S.R. VIPPAGUNTA et al. Adv. Drug Delivery Rev. (2001, 892 reference). **VIPPAGUNTA teaches that, "Predicting the formation of solvates or hydrates of a compound and the number of molecules of water or solvent incorporated into the crystal lattice of a compound is complex and difficult. Each solid compound responds uniquely to the possible formation of solvates or hydrates and hence generalizations cannot be made for a series of related compounds…**

There may be too many possibilities so that no computer programs are currently available for predicting the crystal structures of hydrates and solvates." (page 18).

VIPPAGUNTA teaches that, "The common crystalline forms found for a given drug substance are polymorphs and solvates. Crystalline polymorphs have the same chemical composition, but different internal crystal structures, and therefore, possess different physico-chemical properties." (page 4). "Solvates, also known as pseudopolymorphs, are crystalline solid adducts containing solvent molecules within the crystal structure giving rise to unique differences in the physical and pharmaceutical properties of the drug. If the incorporated solvate is water, a solvate is termed a hydrate." (page 4).

VIPPAGUNTA teaches that, "Because different crystalline polymorphs and solvates differ in crystal packing, and/or molecular conformation as well as in lattice energy and entropy, there are usually significant differences in their physical properties, such as density, hardness, tabletability, refractive index, melting point, enthalpy of fusion, vapor pressure, solubility, dissolution rate, other thermodynamic and kinetic properties and even color. Differences in physical properties of various solid forms have an important effect on the processing of drug substances into drug products, while differences in solubility may have implications on the absorption of the active drug from its dosage form, by affecting the dissolution rate and possibly the mass transport of the molecules." (page 4).

VIPPAGUNTA teaches that, "It is very important to control the crystal form of the drug during the various drug developments, because any phase change due to polymorph interconversions, desolvation of solvates, formation of hydrates and change in the degree of crystallinity can alter the bioavailability of the drug. When going through a phase transition, a

solid drug may undergo a change in its thermodynamic properties, with consequent changes in its dissolution and transport characteristics." (page 5).

VIPPAGUNTA teaches that there are reversible and irreversible polymorphs (page 6), and polymorphs which are structural or conformational polymorphs (pages 7-11). VIPPAGUNTA further teaches that, "The main challenge in managing the phenomenon of multiple solid forms of a drug is the inability to predict the number of forms that can be expected in a given case." (page 11).

VIPPAGUNTA teaches that "Phase changes due to hydration/dehydration and solvation/desolvation of pharmaceutical compounds during processing or in the final product may result in an unstable system that would effect the bioavailability of drug from solid dosage forms. Various types of phase changes are possible in solid-state hydrated or solvated systems in response to changes in environmental conditions… For example, some hydrated compounds may convert to an amorphous phase upon dehydration and some may convert from a lower to a higher state of hydration yielding forms with lower solubility. Alternatively, a kinetically favored but thermodynamically unstable form may be converted during pharmaceutical processing to a more stable and less soluble form." (page 17).

2. The first paragraph of 35 USC 112 requires that the specification contain a written description of *the invention*. Accordingly, where a particular compound has not been *specifically* named or mentioned in any manner, one is left to select from mere *possibilities* encompassed by the broad disclosure, with no guide indicating or directing that this particular selection should be

made rather than any of the many others which could also be made. In re Ruschig, 154 USPQ 118, 122 (CCPA 1967). As elaborated by the court:

> Specific claims to single compounds require reasonably specific supporting disclosure and while we agree with the appellants, as the board did, that *naming* is not essential, something more than the disclosure of a class of 1000, or 100, or even 48, compounds is required. Surely, given time, a chemist could name (especially with the aid of a computer) all of the half million compounds within the scope of the broadest claim, which claim is supported by the broad disclosure. This does not constitute support for each compound individually when separately claimed.

Claimed invention does not contain description in the disclosure. For example R1 in claim 1 can be aryl,

heteroaryl, heterocyclyl, alkylcarbonyl,

arylcarbonyl, **heterocyclylcarbonyl,**

heteroarylcarbonyl,

alkoxycarbonyl, aminocarbonyl,

alkylaminocarbonyl,

dialkylaminocarbonyl,

alkylsulfonyl,

arylsulfonyl,

heterocyclylsulfonyl, heteroarylsulfonyl or a **carbonyl-linked amino acid residue.**

Specification discloses on page 74, a heterocyclic compound where R4 and R5 form a morpholino group. The claimed invention contains thousands of compounds having very different structures. Specification does not contain guidance how all these heterocyclic compounds can be prepared and used.

Applicant has no possession of all the claimed subject matter at the time invention was filed. Applicant is kindly requested to explain the issue.

35 USC § 103(a) Obviousness Rejection

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> *(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.*

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.

3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.

4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over CLERE et al. (US Patent 5,840,682, IDS reference). The reference teaches structurally similar antibacterial compound which embraces presently claimed invention. See the entire document especially abstract, compounds of formula (I) in column 1 and lines 21 and 22 where the R is defined as NH-CH2-COOH.

Instant claims are considered obvious when in prior art m, n, and p are 0 and R represents NH-CH2-COOH. In present claims R6 is hydrogen and R5 is alkyl which can be substituted by carboxy.

Instant claims differ from the reference in that they are of different generic scope. It had been held by Courts that the indiscriminate selection of "some" from among "many" is considered prima facie obvious. In re Lemin, 141 USPQ 814 (1964); National Distillers and Chem. Corp. V. Brenner, 156 USPQ 163.

The instant claimed compounds would have been obvious because one skilled in the art would have been motivated to prepare compounds embraced by the genus of the above cited references with the expectation of obtaining additional beneficial compounds. The instant claimed compounds would have been suggested to one skilled in the art.

One having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to select the claimed compounds from the genus in the reference since such compounds would have been suggested by the reference as a whole. It has been held that a prior art disclosed genus of useful compounds is sufficient to render prima facie obvious a species falling within the genus. In re Susi, 440 F.2d 442, 445, 169 USPQ 423, 425 (CCPA 1971), followed by the Federal Circuit in Merck & Co. V. Biocraft Laboratories, 874 F.2d 804, 10 USPQ 2d 1843, 1846 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

In the light of the forgoing discussion, the Examiner's ultimate legal conclusion is that the subject matter defined by the instant claims would have been obvious within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

COMMUNICATION

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sabiha Qazi whose telephone number is (571) 272-0622. The examiner can normally be reached on any business day except Wednesday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Krass Frederick can be reached on (571) 272-0580. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Sabiha Qazi/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1612